

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the examiner for his suggestions concerning claim amendments to be implemented to overcome objections under 37 CFR 1.75, 35 USC 101 and 35 USC 112. The suggested changes have been made by this amendment. With respect to the objection to claim 17, in which the examiner states that “the claimed terms ‘said subnetwork’ of Line 6 and 9 have no antecedent basis”, the term “said” in line 6 has been replaced with the term “a”. There is no line 9 in the claim.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodriguez (U.S. Publication No. 20020042706), hereinafter Rodriguez, in view of Dunne et al (U. S. Patent No. 5740375), hereinafter Dunne et al. This rejection is not thought to be well taken. First, it is admitted that a router may block the transmission of certain packets of information to the various subnetworks. However, neither Rodriguez nor Dunne et al suggest its use in the context of the present application to provide blockage of various signals to prevent their leaving these various subnetworks. This is especially true since the router prevents the unchanged packet but not the changed packet from being distributed on the various networks. Dunne et al carries out the entire change process in the original subnetworks. The applicant’s invention uses a two-step process wherein a unicast packet is delivered to the second network while the router prevents any transmission of the original packet. The second subnetwork returns computer readable addresses to the first subnetwork which resides thereon. Thus, the applicant’s process and the Dunne et al process are significantly different. It is submitted that this is like saying that no circuit that performs a new function is patentable because of a resistor being placed into the circuit at some strategic location. Accordingly, the claims as a whole must

be considered and there is no indication that any prior art accomplishes what is accomplished herein.

With respect to the examiner's rejection of claims 7, 10-13 and 16-19, these are method or method-type claims corresponding to system claims 1 and 2 and are, therefore, allowable for the reasons previously stated.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject claims distinguish patentably and non-obviously over the prior art of record. An early indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 21, 2007

/William N. Hogg/  
William N. Hogg, Reg. No. 20,156  
CUSTOMER NO. 26675

WNH:cg